

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 5-9, 12-14, and 16-18 are present in this application. Claims 1, 6, 8, 9, and 14 are independent claims.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 6-8, 13, and 16-18 are allowed.

**§ 102(b) Rejection – Wu**

Claims 1, 9 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,116,427 (Wu). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

**Claim 14**

As noted in the interview summary for the interview of April 25, 2008, Wu fails to teach or suggest at least the claimed feature of “a flange-like engaging section, protruding outward from each wall of the frame along a periphery of the frame in a substantially horizontal fashion,” recited in claim 14.

For at least this reason, Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 14 be withdrawn.

Furthermore, according to the present specification at page 13, lines 17-18, the flange-like engaging section 13 is “provided along the entire periphery of the frame 12.”

In contrast, Wu at column 3, lines 19-25, discloses that “the peripheral portion 301 has a top end formed with an oppositely disposed pair of lateral flanges 305.”

Thus, it can be seen that Wu fails to disclose “a flange-like engaging section, protruding outward from each wall of the frame along a periphery of the frame in a substantially horizontal fashion.”

At least because Wu fails to disclose this claimed feature, the rejection of claim 14 based on anticipation must be withdrawn.

Claims 1 and 9

The Examiner's rejection refers to the finger notches 306 as teaching the claimed "positional portion" recited in claims 1 and 9. Applicant submits that the finger notches 306 of Wu are not shown as having a structure "for determining the positional relationship between a surface of the walls of said frame of the display substrate accommodating tray and another display substrate accommodating tray which is to be stacked on said surface of said frame."

Possibly the Examiner has misunderstood the feature of finger notches 306 (the drawing in Figure 3 shows a label 306 for a notch that is coincident with a spacer 340 in the side view; Fig. 2 shows the spacer 340 separate from the notch 306 in the corresponding top view). Wu specifically describes spacers 340 as "upwardly projecting spacers" that contact the bottom side of the device-receiving portion 300 of the upper tray 3 to ensure spacing between the bottom side of the device-receiving portion 300 of the upper tray and the top side of the device-receiving portion 300 of the lower tray 3 (col. 3, lines 44-50).

Finger notches 306 can be seen in the top view shown in Fig. 2. Wu discloses that "finger notches 306" permit extension of a finger of the operator therein for lifting the BGA devices 2 away from the cavities (col. 3, lines 51-60). It is evident from the specification and the drawing shown in Figure 2, that the notches 306, as well as 341, provide a space within which an operator's finger can be extended.

In any case, Wu's finger notches 306 are not disclosed as being a structure "for determining the positional relationship between a surface of the walls of said frame of the display substrate accommodating tray and another display substrate accommodating tray which is to be stacked on said surface of said frame."

In the alternative, the upwardly projecting spacers 340 of Wu also fail to teach the claimed positional portion “provided along a periphery of said frame” and “for determining the positional relationship between a surface of the walls of said frame of the display substrate accommodating tray and another display substrate accommodating tray which is to be stacked on said surface of said frame,” as recited in claims 1 and 9.

Furthermore, according to the present specification, the positioning step 14 establishes a positional relationship between display substrate accommodating tray 10a and another display substrate accommodating tray 10b which is stacked thereon. With reference to Fig. 4, the specification states that the bottom edge of the frame 12 of an upper display substrate accommodating tray 10a is engaged with the positioning step 14 of a lower display substrate accommodating tray 10b, such that the display substrate accommodating trays 10a and 10b stacked vertically do not slip in a horizontal direction with respect to each other (specification at page 15, lines 15-24).

Wu, on the other hand, discloses that, “the spacers 340 on the lower tray contact the bottom side of the device-receiving portion 300 of the upper tray to ensure spacing” (col. 3, lines 44-50). In other words, the spacers 340 serve to separate the bottom of the upper tray from the lower tray.

The Figures of Wu do not show, and Wu does not describe, the spacers 340 provided along a periphery of the frame for determining a positional relationship between the surface of the walls of the frame of the display substrate accommodating tray and another display substrate accommodating tray stacked thereon.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that Wu fails to teach or suggest the claimed “positional portion,” recited in claims 1 and 9. Accordingly, the rejection fails to establish *prima facie* anticipation and should be withdrawn.

**§ 103(a) Rejection – Wu, Nakajima**

Claims 5 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu in view of JP 236,953 (Nakajima). Claims 5 and 12 depend from claims 1 and 9, respectively. For at least the reasons above for claims 1 and 9, Applicant submits that the rejection fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness for claims 5 and 12, and the rejection should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact **Robert Downs** Reg. No. 48,222 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.147; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: June 24, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By Robert Downs #48222  
Charles Gorenstein  
Registration No.: 29,271  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road  
Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicant